

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION

Alecia Ghouralal, )  
Plaintiff, )  
v. )  
United States, Thomas Nelson, )  
John Travers, Hung Nguyen, )  
Catholic Church of Diocese, )  
State of South Carolina, Paul Rambo, )  
Brandy Willey, George R. Rambo, )  
and Scott William Hendrix, )  
Defendants. )  
)

Civil Action No. 2:20-810-BHH

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff Alecia Ghouralal's ("Plaintiff") pro se complaint. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.), the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary review.

On March 4, 2020, Magistrate Judge Mary Gordon Baker issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) outlining the issues and recommending that the Court summarily dismiss Plaintiff’s complaint without issuance and service of process as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Attached to the Magistrate Judge’s Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court

is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections were filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. Finding none, the Court adopts and incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 7), and this action is dismissed without issuance and service of process and is deemed frivolous under § 1915(e)(2)(B).

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks  
The Honorable Bruce Howe Hendricks  
United States District Judge

April 30, 2020  
Charleston, South Carolina